

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 21-30 have been canceled previously. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0259688 of Forte (*Forte*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,580 issued to Fintel, et al. (*Fintel*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are not rendered obvious by *Forte* and *Fintel*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving an incoming telephone call at a private branch exchange, the telephone call directed to a telephone extension of the private branch exchange corresponding to a user;
determining a call routing preference associated with the extension; and
routing the telephone call based on a computing device location and the call routing preference, wherein routing the telephone call includes:
routing the telephone call in an analog format to a telephone associated with the extension if the computing device associated with the user is in docking station, and
routing the telephone call in a Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) digital format to the computing device computing device is not in the docking station.

Thus, Applicants claim routing a telephone call to a telephone or to a computing device based on the location of the computing device. Further, *the call is routed to the telephone in an analog format and to the computing device in a Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) digital format*. Claim 11 similarly recites routing a telephone call to a

telephone or to a computing device in analog or Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) digital format based on the location of the computing device.

Forte discloses routing calls to a wireless device corresponding to a user. See paragraph 0007. Calls are not routed based on the location of a computing device. Further, *Forte* **does not disclose selecting between analog and digital formats** in the manner recited in the claims.

Fintel is cited to teach cellular telephones utilizing docking stations. See Office Action at page 2. *Fintel* discloses routing a call to a cellular phone or to a desk phone based on whether the cellular phone is in a docking station. See Fig. 4. However, like *Forte*, *Fintel* fails to teach or suggest **selecting between analog and digital formats** in the manner recited in the claims. Because neither *Forte* nor *Fintel* disclose use of both digital and analog formats as recited in the claims, no combination of *Forte* and *Fintel* can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-10 and 12-20 are not rendered obvious by *Forte* and *Fintel* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number
02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: April 7, 2010

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 4085-4040
(503) 439-8778